



RE: Request for Meeting and Review of Modified Offer
Lori Potter to: Mia Bearley, Bill Murray
Cc: "Polly Jessen"

09/02/2010 04:01 PM

From: "Lori Potter" <lpotter@kaplankirsch.com>
To: Mia Bearley/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Bill Murray/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "Polly Jessen" <pjessen@kaplankirsch.com>

1 attachment



Draft Agreement PCMC-EPA re_ Use of Richardson Flats Repository.DOC

Bill and Mia: in response to Bill's call to me late yesterday, on behalf of Park City I am providing below the list of attendees for our meeting scheduled for Tuesday, Sept. 7 at 11:00 a.m. at EPA.

I'd also like to confirm, just so that we are clear, that the agenda for Tuesday morning's meeting is discussion of Park City's modified offer dated Monday, August 30, 2010, a copy of which is attached. As background for the discussion, Park City would particularly like to direct the EPA attendees' attention to two explanatory emails:

(1) the 8/31/10 email to Carol Campbell from me, explaining the urgent nature and public interest rationale for the City's offer, including the potential loss of \$1,000,000 in taxpayer funds, immediately below this message; and

(2) the 8/27/2010 email from my partner Polly Jessen to Mia, which provides an overview of the terms of the City's pending modified offer. Polly's email is pasted at the bottom of this message.

Attending in person on behalf of Park City will be Polly Jessen and Brooke McKinley of this firm; Diane Foster, Park City Sustainability Manager, and Joan Card, Park City Environmental Regulatory Affairs Manager. Attending by telephone will be myself; Mayor Dana Williams; and City Manager Tom Bakaly. Park City will supply a call-in number so that those attending by phone can call a common number, as can EPA, to be connected to the meeting. We appreciate your having a speaker phone available at the meeting and assume that will be possible in the conference center; please let us know immediately if it is not.

Thank you for setting up this meeting. We understand from Bill that EPA attendees will be Bill, Mia, Matt Cohn and Carol Campbell. We'd appreciate your letting us know if that changes.

Lori Potter

-----Original Message-----

From: Bearley.Mia@epamail.epa.gov [mailto: Bearley.Mia@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 12:47 PM
To: Lori Potter
Cc: Campbell.Carol@epamail.epa.gov; Diane Foster;
Hernandez.Kathryn@epamail.epa.gov; Cohn.Matthew@epamail.epa.gov; Polly
Jessen; OReilly.Maureen@epa.gov; Dalton.John@epamail.epa.gov; Bill
Murray; Christensen.Stanley@epamail.epa.gov; Martin Hestmark
Subject: Re: Request for Meeting and Review of Modified Offer

Thanks for your email, Lori. Just wanted to let you know that the team has received it and we will respond to your request as soon as possible. Also, Polly, thank you for taking the time to talk with me about this earlier this morning. We very much appreciate having an open line of communication with you.

From: "Lori Potter" <lpotter@kaplankirsch.com>
To: Carol Campbell/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Jim Martin/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, "Tom Daley"
<tdaley@parkcity.org>, "Polly Jessen"
<pjessen@kaplankirsch.com>, "Jason Christensen"
<jason.christensen@parkcity.org>, "Diane Foster"
<Diane.Foster@parkcity.org>, Mia Bearley/R8/USEPA/US@EPA,
Kathryn Hernandez/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Matthew
Cohn/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 08/31/2010 05:09 PM
Subject: Request for Meeting and Review of Modified Offer

Dear Carol: On behalf of Park City, Utah, I'd like to request a meeting with you, or Jim Martin, to discuss a significant proposal to advance the objectives of both EPA and the City in remediating the Silver Creek drainage and resolving critical repository storage issues there.

As I believe you know, on Wednesday, August 25, Park City tendered to EPA a proposal that would save the Park City taxpayers \$1,000,000. This offer contemplated the City's escrowing funds (\$500,000) to apply to settlement or remedial work and the City's commitment to pursue settlement in good faith, including construction a new repository, in exchange for 35,000 cubic yards of capacity at Richardson Flat repository. The \$1 million potential savings represents an amount of taxpayer funded costs for shipments to Tooele, UT, that will be made over the next four to six weeks as the construction season comes to a close. Once spent on hauling to Tooele, this \$1 m. is lost to the taxpayer and the City's remedial efforts.

When Mia Bearley communicated to my office that the original offer had been rejected, Park City worked through the weekend to craft a significantly different offer that explicitly addressed EPA's stated objective of assuring that EPA would have repository capacity available for "site waste" if it allowed Park City to use Richardson Flats for its "development waste". Specifically, the City's modified offer was, in exchange for 10,000 cubic yards of capacity at Richardson Flats, to pay for the actual per-unit cost of alternative disposal at an on- or off-site disposal location for the same amount of site waste from OU2 or OU3. As security for that offer, Park City would escrow the entire \$1 million that will have to be spent on shipping to Tooele. In other words, Park City would assure on a 1:1 basis that the 10,000 yards of capacity it seeks to use now - to save taxpayers \$1 m. - would be

available to EPA, on Park City's dime, if necessary in the future. In addition, the proposal contemplated that the \$1 m escrow would not be released and would be available to apply toward settlement obligations or any judgment awarded to EPA against Park City, if it came to that. This seems like a win-win solution of the type EPA should welcome.

Mia informed us this afternoon that this significantly modified offer had not been presented to you or to Jim Martin, primarily because it is not a final settlement that fully resolves responsibility and cost allocation for building new repository capacity. Park City would respectfully request that you review our settlement offer, a copy of which is attached, because it so plainly serves the public interest for taxpayer funds not to be squandered on high shipping costs and instead applied to remedial efforts. In the meantime, Park City is committed to continuing to work with Mia and Kathy Hernandez towards resolving the longer-term remedial issues in a fresh, good-faith, and effective way.

The opportunity to save \$1 m. in taxpayer funds and direct it to this remedial effort will soon be lost. Beginning on Monday, Park City is spending \$20,000/day on disposal costs. We urgently request your review of the City's proposal and that you meet with us this week (by Sept. 3, 2010) to move forward on it or a variation that can address this significant short-term issue.

Thank you very much.

Lori Potter

Kaplan Kirsch & Rockwell LLP
1675 Broadway, Suite 2300
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 825-7000
(303) 825-7005 fax
lpotter@kaplankirsch.com
www.kaplankirsch.com

This message is intended for the recipient only. It may contain confidential or privileged information. If you receive this message in error, please delete it and notify the sender.

(See attached file: Draft Agreement PCMC-EPA re_ Use of Richardson Flats Repository.DOC)

08/27/2010

Mia,

After our last conversation, I relayed to Park City your response that, while Park City's previous offer was well-received, in no event will EPA release capacity unless it is assured of equivalent capacity to dispose of "site waste" if Park City does not reach agreement with EPA to build a new repository. I also relayed EPA's continued reticence to pursue any interim agreement.

With that additional information, Park City asked that I relay a modified offer that provides assurance to EPA of alternative capacity regardless of the outcome of the negotiation of a multi-party agreement. Park City will begin spending \$20,000 per day on Monday to dispose of its development-related mine waste at Tooele and already has spent \$200,000. The modified offer includes putting into escrow the cost of disposing the estimated amount of development waste that otherwise would go to Tooele as security for Park City's commitment to cover costs of an alternative disposal location if EPA needs that capacity in the future. The modified offer is outlined below.

Park City intends to move forward in good faith with negotiation of a multi-party agreement. Again, the objective of pushing for this interim approach is to reach some reasonable approach that will avoid wasting taxpayer money on Tooele that could go to OU3 cleanup.

Offer

1. Park City will place \$1,000,000 in escrow to secure its obligations below. Interest will accrue and be maintained in the escrow account.

2. EPA will authorize Park City to haul up to an additional 10,000 cubic yards to Richardson Flats immediately. Park City is currently paying slightly less than \$100 per cubic yard for disposal at a permitted facility. Therefore the cost of disposal of 10,000 cubic yards at a permitted facility is \$1,000,000.

3. Park City will agree:

a. to negotiate in good faith to reach agreement with EPA regarding cost sharing and response action obligations within the proposed OU3, including construction of a new onsite repository to supplement capacity at Richardson Flats ("Settlement");

b. to pay the actual per/cubic yard cost of off-site or on-site disposal of a quantity of waste equal to the quantity of material that Park City disposes of at Richardson Flats, in the event that:

(i) Park City has not reached Settlement with EPA;

(ii) the Richardson Flats repository has reached capacity with other "site waste"; and

(iii) "site waste" remains in Operable Units 2 and 3 of the Richardson Flats Site that has been designated for disposal at the Richardson Flats repository or another on-site repository under the selected remedy.

4. When Settlement is reached, the \$1,000,000 in escrow will be the first funds spent from Park City's contribution (meaning that Park City would not need to contribute additional funds until after the \$1,000,000 had been utilized);

5. If Settlement is not reached, any escrowed funds remaining after payment of disposal costs under paragraph 2 above will be first applied to satisfy any judgment for cost recovery in OU3 that may be awarded against Park City to EPA. Any remainder after payment of the foregoing costs, or expiration of the statute of limitations for cost recovery action, will be returned to Park City.

I understand you are out until Monday, but, as indicated in my earlier message, would like to try to follow up in a meeting or call on Monday, if possible. Thanks, Mia.

Have a good weekend!

Polly B. Jessen
Kaplan Kirsch & Rockwell LLP
1675 Broadway, Suite 2300
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 825-7000
www.kaplankirsch.com

The information contained in this e-mail message is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the recipient(s) named above. This message may be an attorney-client communication and/or work product and as such is privileged and confidential. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or an agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail, and delete the original message.



Re: Request for Meeting and Review of Modified Offer

Mia Bearley to: Lori Potter

09/01/2010 12:46 PM

Carol Campbell, "Diane Foster", Kathryn Hernandez, Matthew Cohn,
Cc: "Polly Jessen", O'Reilly, Maureen, John Dalton, Bill Murray, Stanley
Christensen, Martin Hestmark

From: Mia Bearley/R8/USEPA/US
To: "Lori Potter" <lpotter@kaplankirsch.com>
Cc: Carol Campbell/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, "Diane Foster" <Diane.Foster@parkcity.org>, Kathryn
Hernandez/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Matthew Cohn/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, "Polly Jessen"
<pjessen@kaplankirsch.com>, O'Reilly, Maureen@epa.gov, John Dalton/R8/USEPA/US@EPA,

Thanks for your email, Lori. Just wanted to let you know that the team has received it and we will respond to your request as soon as possible. Also, Polly, thank you for taking the time to talk with me about this earlier this morning. We very much appreciate having an open line of communication with you.

"Lori Potter"

Dear Carol: On behalf of Park City, Utah, I'd like...

08/31/2010 05:09:08 PM

From: "Lori Potter" <lpotter@kaplankirsch.com>
To: Carol Campbell/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Jim Martin/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, "Tom Daley" <tdaley@parkcity.org>, "Polly Jessen"
<pjessen@kaplankirsch.com>, "Jason Christensen" <jason.christensen@parkcity.org>, "Diane
Foster" <Diane.Foster@parkcity.org>, Mia Bearley/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Kathryn
Hernandez/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Matthew Cohn/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 08/31/2010 05:09 PM
Subject: Request for Meeting and Review of Modified Offer

Dear Carol: On behalf of Park City, Utah, I'd like to request a meeting with you, or Jim Martin, to discuss a significant proposal to advance the objectives of both EPA and the City in remediating the Silver Creek drainage and resolving critical repository storage issues there.

As I believe you know, on Wednesday, August 25, Park City tendered to EPA a proposal that would save the Park City taxpayers \$1,000,000. This offer contemplated the City's escrowing funds (\$500,000) to apply to settlement or remedial work and the City's commitment to pursue settlement in good faith, including construction a new repository, in exchange for 35,000 cubic yards of capacity at Richardson Flat repository. The \$1 million potential savings represents an amount of taxpayer funded costs for shipments to Tooele, UT, that will be made over the next four to six weeks as the construction season comes to a close. Once spent on hauling to Tooele, this \$1 m. is lost to the taxpayer and the City's remedial efforts.

When Mia Bearley communicated to my office that the original offer had been rejected, Park City worked through the weekend to craft a significantly different offer that explicitly addressed EPA's stated objective of assuring that EPA would have repository capacity available for "site waste" if it allowed Park City to use Richardson Flats for its "development waste". Specifically, the City's modified offer was, in exchange for 10,000 cubic yards of capacity at Richardson Flats, to pay for the actual per-unit cost of alternative disposal at an on- or off-site disposal location for the same amount of site waste from OU2 or OU3. As security for that offer, Park City would escrow the entire \$1 million that will have to be spent on shipping to Tooele. In other words, Park City would assure on a 1:1 basis that the 10,000 yards of capacity it seeks to use now – to save taxpayers \$1 m. – would be available to EPA, on Park City's dime, if necessary in the future. In addition, the proposal contemplated that the \$1 m escrow would not be released and would be available to apply toward settlement obligations or any judgment awarded to EPA against Park City, if it came to that. This seems like a win-win solution of the type EPA should welcome.

Mia informed us this afternoon that this significantly modified offer had not been presented to you or to Jim Martin, primarily because it is not a final settlement that fully resolves responsibility and cost allocation for building new repository capacity. Park City would respectfully request that you review our settlement offer, a copy of which is attached, because it so plainly serves the public interest for taxpayer funds not to be

squandered on high shipping costs and instead applied to remedial efforts. In the meantime, Park City is committed to continuing to work with Mia and Kathy Hernandez towards resolving the longer-term remedial issues in a fresh, good-faith, and effective way.

The opportunity to save \$1 m. in taxpayer funds and direct it to this remedial effort will soon be lost. Beginning on Monday, Park City is spending \$20,000/day on disposal costs. We urgently request your review of the City's proposal and that you meet with us this week (by Sept. 3, 2010) to move forward on it or a variation that can address this significant short-term issue.

Thank you very much.

Lori Potter

Kaplan Kirsch & Rockwell LLP
1675 Broadway, Suite 2300
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 825-7000
(303) 825-7005 fax
lpotter@kaplankirsch.com
www.kaplankirsch.com

This message is intended for the recipient only. It may contain confidential or privileged information. If you receive this message in error, please delete it and notify the sender.



Draft Agreement PCMC-EPA re_ Use of Richardson Flats Repository.DOC

[Determine appropriate title and header for agreement]

**Interim Agreement between the Environmental Protection Agency and Park City
Municipal Corporation Addressing Use of the Richardson Flat Tailings Site
Repository for Disposal of Development Waste**

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This Agreement ("Agreement") is made and entered into by and between the United States on behalf of the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") and Park City Municipal Corporation (collectively the "Parties").

2. This Agreement is entered into pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. § 9601, *et seq.* and the authority of the Attorney General of the United States to compromise and settle claims of the United States.

3. Park City Municipal Corporation ("PCMC") is a municipal corporation organized under the laws of the state of Utah.

4. The Parties agree to undertake all actions required by the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

5. The Parties agree that PCMC's entry into this Agreement, and the actions undertaken by PCMC in accordance with the Agreement, do not constitute an admission of any liability by PCMC.

6. The resolution of the matters addressed in this Agreement is in the public interest.

II. DEFINITIONS

7. Unless otherwise expressly provided herein, terms used in this Agreement that are defined in CERCLA or in regulations promulgated under CERCLA shall have

the meaning assigned to them in CERCLA or in such regulations, including any amendments thereto. Whenever terms listed below are used in this Agreement, the following definitions shall apply:

a) "Agreement" shall mean this Agreement and all appendices hereto.

In the event of conflict between this Agreement and any appendix, this Agreement shall control.

b) "CERCLA" shall mean the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 9601, *et seq.*

c) "Day" shall mean a calendar day unless expressly stated to be a working day. "Working day" shall mean a day other than a Saturday, Sunday, or Federal holiday. In computing any period of time under this Agreement, where the last day would fall on a Saturday, Sunday, or Federal holiday, the period shall run until the close of business of the next working day.

d) "Development Waste" shall mean currently unexposed Waste Material that may be exposed during future development activities on property owned or designated by PCMC.

e) "Effective Date" shall mean the effective date of this Agreement as provided in Section XIV.

f) "EPA" shall mean the United States Environmental Protection Agency and any successor departments or agencies of the United States.

g) "Interest" shall mean interest at the rate specified for interest on investments of the EPA Hazardous Substance Superfund established by 26 U.S.C.

§ 9507, compounded annually on October 1 of each year, in accordance with 42 U.S.C. § 9607(a). The applicable rate of interest shall be the rate in effect at the time the interest accrues. The rate of interest is subject to change on October 1 of each year.

h) “OU2” shall mean Operable Unit 2 of the Richardson Flat Tailings Site.

i) “OU3” shall mean a new Operable Unit 3 proposed for the Richardson Flat Tailings Site, which would include cleanup of approximately 276 acres in the northern portion of lower Silver Creek, the middle reach of Silver Creek, and the Silver Maple Claims Site as well as construction of a new mine waste repository.

j) “Paragraph” shall mean a portion of this Agreement identified by an Arabic numeral.

k) “Parties” shall mean the United States on behalf of EPA and PCMC.

l) “PCMC” shall mean Park City Municipal Corporation.

m) “Richardson Flat Tailings Site” shall mean the Richardson Flat Tailings Site, CERCLIS ID # UTD980952840, which is located approximately 1.5 miles northeast of Park City, Utah and includes property owned by UPCM and PCMC, among others. The Richardson Flat Tailings Site is the location of a mine tailings impoundment that covers approximately 160 acres in the northwest corner of UPCM’s property and includes diversion ditches, wetlands and other features. A Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study of OU2 of the Richardson

Flat Tailings Site is underway as of the date of this Agreement and EPA has begun negotiation of a multi-party agreement for a response action in the proposed OU3. The Richardson Flat Tailings Site has been used as a repository for mining wastes from the Silver Creek Watershed.

n) "Section" shall mean a portion of this Agreement identified by a capitalized Roman numeral.

o) "Settlement" shall mean a multi-party agreement to conduct a non-time critical removal action in the proposed OU3, among EPA, PCMC, the United States Bureau of Land Management ("BLM"), the Utah Department of Environmental Quality ("UDEQ"), and UPCM, or some combination thereof.

p) "Site Waste" shall mean Waste Material currently exposed within the Silver Creek Watershed.

q) "Soils Ordinance" shall mean PCMC's Landscaping and Maintenance of Soil Cover Ordinance, Park City Municipal Code, Title 11, Chapter 15.

r) "United States" shall mean the United States of America, its departments, agencies, and instrumentalities.

s) "UPCM" means United Park City Mines Company.

t) "Waste Material" shall mean (1) any "hazardous substance" under Section 101(14) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(14); (2) any pollutant or contaminant under Section 101(33) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(33), and (3) any "solid waste" under Section 1004(27) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6903(27).

III. STATEMENT OF FACTS

8. PCMC owns property within the Silver Creek Watershed, which is located in Park City, Summit County, Utah.

9. In cooperation with EPA and the Utah Department of Environmental Quality, PCMC developed and implemented the Soils Ordinance to contain and dispose of soils impacted with mine tailings within Park City.

10. The Soils Ordinance requires covering soils exceeding established lead levels which are left in place with six inches of approved topsoil and acceptable cover or disposing such soil at a permitted facility.

11. Development of PCMC-owned property has resulted in Development Waste within the Soils Ordinance boundary.

12. Pursuant to the Soils Ordinance, such contaminated soils must be properly disposed of at designated facility. Until May 11, 2010, PCMC disposed of mine-impacted soils at the repository at Richardson Flat Tailings Site, which is owned by UPMC and within the Silver Creek watershed.

13. On May 11, 2010, EPA directed UPCM to stop accepting Development Waste from PCMC to preserve capacity for anticipated Site Waste originating from OU2 and proposed OU3.

14. PCMC is currently undertaking a number of development projects within Park City which are generating Development Waste.

15. Because EPA has declined to further authorize PCMC to use the Richardson Flat Tailings Site repository, PCMC has been required to ship Development

Waste to a facility in Tooele, Utah. The shipping and disposal of Development Waste in Tooele is estimated to cost \$20,000 per day.

16. At present, the Settlement is under negotiation.

17. PCMC has expressed its interest in negotiating an agreement with EPA pursuant to which it would be permitted to utilize capacity at the Richardson Flat Tailings Site repository until Settlement is reached.

18. Until a Settlement regarding a new mine waste repository within OU3 can be reached, EPA and PCMC have determined that additional capacity at the Richardson Flat Tailings Site repository will be made available to PCMC under the terms and conditions set forth in Section IV below.

19. The Parties intend that this Agreement will preserve capacity for mine waste from OU2 and OU3 while avoiding unnecessary costs to PCMC of shipping waste to Tooele.

IV. AGREEMENT

20. In consideration of and in exchange for the EPA's authorization for PCMC to dispose of 10,000 cubic yards of Development Waste at the Richardson Flat Tailings Site repository commencing immediately upon the Effective Date of this Agreement, PCMC agrees to comply with all provisions of this Agreement.

V. PAYMENT

21. In consideration of and in exchange for EPA's authorization for PCMC to dispose of 10,000 cubic yards of Development Waste at the Richardson Flat Tailings Site repository immediately upon the Effective Date of this Agreement, PCMC agrees as follows:

a) to negotiate in good faith to reach Settlement with EPA regarding cost sharing and response action obligations within the proposed OU3, including construction of a new onsite repository to supplement capacity at the Richardson Flat Tailings Site;

b) to pay the actual per/cubic yard cost of off-site or on-site disposal of a quantity of waste equal to the quantity of material that PCMC disposes of at the Richardson Flat Tailings Site, in the event that:

i) Park City has not reached Settlement with EPA;

ii) the Richardson Flat Tailings Site repository has reached capacity; and

iii) Site Waste remains in OU2 or OU3 of the Richardson Flat Tailings Site that has been designed for disposal at the Richardson Flat Tailings Site repository or another on-site repository under the selected remedy for OU2 or OU3.

c) Park City shall place \$1,000,000 into an interest bearing escrow account to secure its obligations under this Agreement. Interest will accrue and be maintained in the escrow account.

d) When Settlement is reached, the \$1,000,000 and interest in escrow will be the first funds applied toward PCMC's share of such Settlement obligations. PCMC shall not be required to contribute additional funds or expend

additional amounts until after the \$1,000,000 has been fully applied to PCMC's share of such Settlement obligations. Any escrowed fund in excess of PCMC's Settlement obligations shall be released to PCMC immediately upon such Settlement.

22. If Settlement is not reached, any escrowed funds remaining after payment of disposal costs under Paragraph 21 above will be first applied to satisfy any judgment for cost recovery in OU3 that may be awarded against PCMC to EPA. Any remainder after payment of the foregoing costs, or expiration of the statute of limitations for any such cost recovery action by EPA, shall be returned to PCMC.

23. At the time the funds are placed in escrow, PCMC shall send notice of the same to EPA in accordance with Section XIII (Notices and Submissions).

24. PCMC shall make all payments required by this Section by FedWire Electronic Funds Transfer ("EFT") to the _____ account in accordance with current EFT procedures, referencing EPA Site/Spill Number ____.

25. Amounts due and owing pursuant to the terms of this Agreement but not paid in accordance with the terms of this Agreement shall accrue Interest.

VI. DISPUTE RESOLUTION

26. Unless otherwise expressly provided for in this Agreement, the dispute resolution procedures of this Section shall be the exclusive mechanism to resolve disputes between EPA and PCMC arising under or with respect to PCMC's obligations under this Agreement. However, the procedures set forth in this Section shall not apply to actions that have not been disputed in accordance with this Section.

27. Any dispute which arises under or with respect to this Agreement shall in the first instance be the subject of informal negotiations. The period for informal negotiations shall not exceed thirty (30) days from the time the dispute arises, unless it is extended by written agreement of the Parties. The dispute shall be considered to have arisen when either party submits to the other a written Notice of Dispute. Any agreement relating to a Notice of Dispute which is reached as a result of informal negotiations shall be in writing signed by EPA and PCMC.

28. In the event that the Parties cannot resolve a dispute by informal negotiations, EPA shall provide PCMC a written decision on the dispute. Thereafter, EPA may pursue whatever remedies it may have under law, including the right to seek judicial enforcement of this Agreement.

29. The existence of a dispute, as defined in this Section, and EPA's consideration of matters placed into dispute shall not excuse, toll or suspend any other compliance obligation or deadline required pursuant to this Agreement during the pendency of the dispute resolution process.

30. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, any action or decision by EPA pursuant to this Agreement shall not constitute final agency action giving rise to any rights to judicial review prior to EPA's initiation of judicial action to compel PCMC's compliance with this Agreement.

VII. FINANCIAL ASSURANCE

31. PCMC has selected, and EPA has approved, as a Financial Assurance mechanism an escrow account pursuant to Section V. PCMC shall submit all executed and/or otherwise finalized instruments and other documents required to make the selected

Financial Assurance mechanism legally binding, in a form substantially identical to the documents attached hereto as Appendix ____, to EPA Financial Analyst [insert name], with a copy to EPA in accordance with Section XIII (Notices and Submissions).

32. If PCMC desires to change the form or terms of any Financial Assurance mechanism(s), or cancel or discontinue any Financial Assurance mechanism(s), PCMC shall make this request to EPA in writing and EPA shall either approve or disapprove the request in writing.

VIII. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS BY UNITED STATES

33. The United States reserves, and this Agreement is without prejudice to, all rights against PCMC with respect to all other matters, including but not limited to, the following:

- a) claims based on a failure by PCMC to meet a requirement of this Agreement;
- b) any liability of PCMC resulting from past or future releases or threatened of hazardous substances, or pollutants or contaminants;
- c) any criminal liability;
- d) any liability of PCMC for damages for injury to, destruction of, or loss of natural resources, and for the costs of any natural resource damage assessment incurred by federal agencies other than EPA; and
- e) any liability of PCMC for violations of local, State or federal law or regulations.

34. Nothing in this Agreement is intended as a release or covenant not to sue for any claim or cause of action, administrative or judicial, civil or criminal, past or

future, in law or in equity, which the United States may have against any person, firm, corporation or other entity not a party to this Agreement.

35. Nothing in this Agreement is intended to limit the right of EPA to undertake future response actions at the Site or to seek to compel parties other than the PCMC to perform or pay for response actions at the Site. Nothing in this Agreement shall in any way restrict or limit the nature or scope of response actions which may be taken or be required by EPA in exercising its authority under federal law.

IX. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS BY PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION

36. PCMC reserves, and this Agreement is without prejudice to, all rights and defenses otherwise available to PCMC with respect to all other matters, including but not limited to, the following:

- a) claims based on a failure by EPA to meet a requirement of this Agreement or the NCP;
- b) any liability of PCMC resulting from past or future releases or threatened of hazardous substances, or pollutants or contaminants;
- c) any criminal liability;
- d) any liability of PCMC for damages for injury to, destruction of, or loss of natural resources, and for the costs of any natural resource damage assessment incurred by federal agencies other than EPA; and
- e) any liability of PCMC for violations of local, State or federal law or regulations.

37. Nothing in this Agreement is intended as a release or covenant not to sue for any claim or cause of action, administrative or judicial, civil or criminal, past or

future, in law or in equity, which PCMC may have against any person, firm, corporation or other entity not a party to this Agreement.

38. Nothing in this Agreement is intended to limit the right of PCMC to seek to compel parties other than the PCMC to perform or pay for response actions at the Site.

X. DOCUMENT RETENTION

39. PCMC agrees to retain and make available to EPA all business and operating records, contracts, site studies and investigations, and documents relating to the disposal of PCMC Development Waste at the Richardson Flat Tailings Site repository pursuant to this Agreement, for at least ten years, following the Effective Date of this Agreement unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the Parties. At the end of ten years, PCMC shall notify EPA of the location of such documents and shall provide EPA with an opportunity to copy any documents at EPA's expense.

XI. PAYMENT OF COSTS

40. If PCMC fails to comply with the terms of this Agreement, it shall be liable for all litigation and other enforcement costs incurred by the United States to enforce this Agreement or otherwise obtain compliance.

XII. PROJECT COORDINATORS

41. The EPA's Project Coordinator for this Property is:

Kathryn Hernandez
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8
999 Eighteenth Street, Suite 300 (8EPR-SR)
Denver, CO 80202-2466

42. PCMC's Project Coordinator for this Property is:

Diane Foster
Park City Municipal Corporation
445 Marsac Avenue
P.O. Box 1480
Park City, UT 84060

43. EPA may designate other representatives, including, but not limited to, EPA employees and federal contractors and consultants, to observe and monitor the progress of any activity undertaken pursuant to this Agreement.

44. PCMC's legal counsel shall not serve as its Project Coordinator. Instead, PCMC's Project Coordinator shall be PCMC's then-current Environmental Sustainability Manager or a PCMC employee with similar responsibilities on behalf of PCMC.

45. PCMC shall notify EPA in writing ten (10) days prior to any change of its Project Coordinator.

XIII. NOTICES AND SUBMISSIONS

46. Whenever under the terms of this Agreement written notice is required to be given by one Party to another, it shall be directed to the individuals or office at the addresses specified below, unless those individuals or their successors give written notice of a change to the other Party. All notices and submissions shall be considered effective upon receipt, unless otherwise provided. Written notice as specified herein shall constitute complete satisfaction of any written notice requirement of this Agreement with respect to EPA and PCMC respectively.

As to EPA:

Kathryn Hernandez
EPA Project Coordinator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8
999 Eighteenth Street, Suite 300 (8EPR-SR)

Denver, CO 80202-2466

And

Mia Bearley
Enforcement Attorney
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8
999 Eighteenth Street, Suite 300 (8-ENFL)
Denver, CO 80202-2466

As to PCMC:

Diane Foster
Park City Municipal Corporation
445 Marsac Avenue
P.O. Box 1480
Park City, UT 84060

XIV. EFFECTIVE DATE

47. The effective date of this Agreement shall be the date upon which EPA issues written notice to PCMC that EPA has fully executed the Agreement.

XV. COUNTERPART ORIGINALS

48. This Agreement may be executed in two or more counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which shall constitute one and the same instrument.

[Insert signature blocks]